



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,795	03/10/2004	Carlos R. Plata-Salaman	ORT-1575CON	4508
27777	7590	07/08/2005	EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			SPIVACK, PHYLLIS G	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1614		

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/797,795	PLATA-SALAMAN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Phyllis G. Spivack	1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6-28-04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Applicants' Preliminary amendment filed March 10, 2004 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-32 are presented. Updated priority information is noted. Amendments to claims 20 and 32 are noted.

An Information Disclosure Statement filed June 28, 2004 is further acknowledged and has been reviewed. All copending applications have been considered.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-32 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,589,985. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of overlapping subject matter.

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Parenthetical subject matter renders the claims in which they appear indefinite. It is unclear whether or not claim limitations are intended.

Art Unit: 1614

Improper Markush language is used in claims 20-31. Specifically, the term "and" should be used in place of "or" when reciting options within a group beginning with the phrase "selected from the group consisting of".

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims are directed to the prevention of any neurodegenerative disorder and numerous pathologies as recited in claims 20-31. The specification provides support for cell survival rates following the administration of an enantiomer of instant Formula Ib and IIb and transient cerebral ischemia in a rat model following administration of a compound of Formula Ib.

Attention is directed to In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 where the court set forth factors to consider when assessing whether or not a disclosure would require undue experimentation. These factors are:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided
- 3) the presence or absence of working examples
- 4) the nature of the invention
- 5) the state of the art
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

The instant specification fails to provide guidance that would allow the skilled artisan background sufficient to practice the instant invention without resorting to undue experimentation in view of further discussion below.

The nature of the invention, state of the prior art, relative skill of those in the art and the predictability of the art

The claimed invention relates to prevention or treatment of a plethora of neurodegenerative disorders.

The relative skill of those in the art is generally that of a Ph.D. or M.D. with expertise in the field of neurology.

Each particular neurodegenerative disorder has its own specific characteristics and etiology. The broad recitation "preventing or treating a neurodegenerative disorder" is inclusive of many conditions that presently have no established successful therapies.

It is clear the art to which the present invention relates is highly unpredictable and unreliable with respect to conclusions drawn from laboratory data extrapolated to clinical efficacy.

The breadth of the claims

The claims are very broad and inclusive of many disorders of diverse etiology.

The amount of direction or guidance provided and the presence or absence of working examples

The working examples are limited to the generic terms "an enantiomer of Formula Ib or Formula IIb" in Table 1 and "an enantiomer of Formula Ib" in Table 2 without reciting what compound is actually contemplated.

The quantity of experimentation necessary

Applicants have failed to provide guidance as to which particular compound would be preferred for treatment of the many neurodegenerative disorders that are encompassed in the claim language. The skilled artisan would expect the interaction of a particular compound in the treatment or prevention of a particular disease state to be very specific and highly unpredictable absent a clear understanding of the structural and biochemical basis for each agent. The instant specification sets forth no such understanding or any criteria for extrapolating beyond the vague data presented in Examples 1 and 2. Even for the data presented, no direction is provided to apply the information to a specific disease state. Absent reasonable *a priori* expectations of success for using a particular chemotherapeutic agent to prevent or treat any particular neurodegenerative disorder, one skilled in the neurology art would have to test extensively many compounds to discover which particular disorder responds to that particular compound. Since each prospective embodiment, as well as future embodiments as the art progresses, would have to be empirically tested, undue experimentation would be required to practice the invention as it is claimed in its current scope. The specification provides inadequate guidance to do otherwise.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-20 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Choi et al., U.S. Patent 5,854,283.

Choi teaches the administration of compounds of instant Formula I and II to treat disorders of the central nervous system. See column 3. In addition to exhibiting neuroprotective properties, convulsions, epilepsy, stroke and muscle spasm, which characterize neurodegenerative disorders, are specifically highlighted as therapeutic endpoints. The disclosure encompasses pure enantiomeric forms and enantiomeric mixtures wherein one of the enantiomers predominates to the extent of about 90% or greater, preferably, about 98% or greater. See column 4.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Phyllis G. Spivack whose telephone number is 571-272-0585. The Examiner can normally be reached Mondays to Fridays from 10:30 AM to 7 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful after one business day, the Examiner's supervisor, Chris Low, can be reached at telephone number 571-272-0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 1614

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Phyllis G. Spivack  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1614

**PHYLLIS SPIVACK**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

July 7, 2005